THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

EDITED BY THE REV PITT MORSE.

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men" St. Luke, 2. 14.
"How beautiful are the feet of him that publisheth salvation!" Isa. 52. 7.

VOL. I. SATURDAY, AUGUST 9, 1823. NO. 19.

ON HERESY. BY R. WRIGHT.

As the cry of *Heresy* has frequently spread an alarm, roused the spirit of persecution, let loose the worst passions of the human heart, dismembered churches, and produced animosity and confusion among christian brethren, it seems requisite for me to take some notice of the nature of heresy, and guard the reader against the too common abuse of the term. It is to be hoped that in the present enlightened age the cry of heresy has ceased to terrify, and light the torch of discord, as it once did: yet there is reason to fear that some men are still so weak as to be deterred from the free examination of subjects by the magic of its sound. Formerly *heretic* was the most odious name with which a man could be branded; and heresy deemed the greatest of crimes; consequently heretics were thought worthy of the severest punishment; but it is to be hoped such days of ignorance and barbarity will no more return. According to ancient writers, the word *heresy* in its primitive acceptation, was harmless—*as* (says a great writer) *it only signified election or choice, and is used for an opinion, which a man chooseth, as best or most probable. Heresy and heretic, are often used by ancient writers, as words of indifferent meaning, and the several ways of philosophizing were called sects or heresies.* It might be useful to us to adhere to the primitive acceptation of the word, then we should not conclude any thing unfavorable to the character of a man from his being called a heretic; only that he differed in his opinions from those who called him so, a thing which certainly has nothing of criminality in it.

It is curious to observe how variously the words heresy and heretic have been applied. The doctrines of *Athanasius*, of *Arius*, of *Sabellius*, of *Luther*, of *Calvin*, of *Socinus*, have all been pronounced heresies. The same doctrines have been heretical in one age, and orthodox in another. What has been thought so heretical as to deserve the most cruel death in one country, has been thought worthy of honors and emoluments in another. *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, and others among the reformers, thought a dissent from their opinions heresy, and that those who dared to dissent from them ought to be burned alive. The *Pope* of Rome, said they were all heretics, for they all dissented from him, and that they ought all to burned alive. The reformers destroyed men for their opinions; but the Pope destroyed the greatest number, for he had most power.—It is evident the Pope and the reformers acted upon the same principle towards those they called heretics; both construed difference of opinion into a crime, and then concluded it to be deserving of capital punishment. It was a fatal mistake, and caused the immolation of multitudes of innocent victims. It is difficult to say what has not been called heresy at one time or other.—Were we to conclude all in the list of heretics who have been branded with the name, who among the professors of the gospel could claim exemption: for what party is there among christians which has not, at one time or other, had the odious epithet applied to it? It is evident there must have been some abuse, or at least some misapplication, of terms in this business. After the equivocal and indiscriminate application of the terms heretic and heresy, among christians of different denominations, there can be nothing in them to frighten the man of virtuous and independent mind. As the word has been generally applied, a heresy is an opinion not generally received; and a heretic one who, in thinking for himself, and acting according to the dictates of his own conscience, differs from others. But in this there is nothing contrary to integrity and virtue. *Paul* was a heretic in the eyes of the Jews, and confessed that after the way which they called heresy, so worshipped he the God of his fathers, *Acts* xxiv. 14.

It is acknowledged that the word heresy is sometimes used by the apostles in a bad sense; but then it is never applied to mere matters of opinion, nor to those errors which may consist with integrity. The heresies mentioned, 1 *Cor.* xi. 19. consisted, not in erroneous sentiments merely, but in persons, influenced by a sectarian spirit, dividing the church into parties, breaking the unity of the spirit and dissolving the bonds of peace. When persons in the present day form their private opinions into articles of faith, and refuse to hold communion with any but those

who will receive them as such, they become the authors of such heresies as the apostle described; not so those men who, though deemed heretical by their brethren, labor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace with all their fellow christians. Again. *Gal.* v. 20. heresies are reckoned among immoral practices: which shows that the apostle applied the term, not to involuntary mistakes, but to something of an immoral nature: and indeed there can be no worse heresy than holding the truth in unrighteousness, nor any worse heretics than immoral professors of the gospel. But it has been acknowledged by their opponents that many of those who have been branded with the name of heretics have been the most virtuous of men; than which nothing can be a stronger proof of the misapplication of the term. Those whom *Peter* describes as bringing in damnable heresies, are evidently vicious characters, who deny the Lord by their abominable practices. 2 *Pet* ii. 1. not pious men who differ from others in their sentiments. The *Heretic* which *Paul* would have rejected, is not an upright mistaken man, but one who is so far subverted as to allow himself in known sin, and is self condemned; for no man can be self-condemned but he who does what he believes to be wrong. *Tit.* iii. 11. Those are the most like *Paul's* heretic who from sinister motives act contrary to their own consciences in religious matters; but there can be no propriety in applying what he says to a sincere and virtuous man, who judges for himself, and speaks and acts with integrity, whatever may be his mistake. Seeing christians at large vary in their opinions, and differ in some points of christian practice, if a religious difference be a heresy, who is to decide to what persons or parties among them the charge of heresy attaches, and who they are to whom it does not belong? If a real heretic be one who, to attain some sinister end, foments divisions among christians, aims to set himself over his brethren, and become the head of a party, and who in effecting his purpose acts contrary to what he knows to be right, there can be no difficulty in judging who are not, and who are real heretics. Such are the characters the apostles exhorted christians to avoid. *Rom.* xvi. 17 Let us never reject any man as an heretic, who is sincere in what he professes, and whose conversation is consistent with the gospel of Christ; for the Lord Jesus will not reject such at his coming; besides by rejecting such we should foment divisions among christians, and perhaps make way for the increase of heresies, or sects.

BRAMUNICAL ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE TRINITY.

(Continued from page 144)

This reply occupies the whole of the number, consisting of twenty-four pages of English, and as many of Bengalee, printed opposite to each other. Some of the arguments, as might be expected, are not so forcible as others; but we think that our readers will agree with us, that when the novelty of this controversy is considered, and the little preparation from study which a Hindoo could have received, the reasoning is in every way remarkably acute and sound.

The first question is one, which it was very natural for a native to put. He reasons with himself thus. If the Father is God, and the Son is God, and there is but one God, why then the Son is the Father. But how can the son be the very Father? Of course the missionaries answer this objection in the usual way. But let us hear the account of the Hindoo.

"As to my first question proposed in the Magazine in the following words, 'They call Jesus Christ the Son of God, and the very God. How can the Son be the very Father?' the Editor denies the accuracy of the information on which I found this question, and firmly asserts that 'the Bible no where says that the Son is the Father.' I therefore deem it necessary to show my reason for the above query, leaving it to the public to pronounce on the justifiableness of it, either in their conversation, or religious publications.

"Christian teachers profess that God is one, and that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and the very God. Hence I naturally concluded that they believe the Son to be the Father, and consequently questioned the reasonableness of such a doctrine. For when a person affirms that such a one, say James, is one, and that John is his son, and again says that John is actually James, we should naturally conclude that he means that John the son is James the father, and be at liberty to ask, how can John the son be James the father? But as the Editor, a leading minister of that religion, declares that 'the Bible no where says that the Son is the Father, but says that the Son is equal to the Father in nature and essence, and distinct in person,' and recommends me to reflect on mankind, of whom 'every son, who has not the same human nature with his father, must be a monster,' it would be too much boldness on my part to give preference to my apprehension of the meaning of the Bible over that of the Editor. I would

therefore have admitted, as suggested by the Editor, that the Son of God is God, on the analogy, and in the sense that the son of man is a man, had I not been compelled by his very suggestion to reject entirely his other still more important assertion—that is, the coeval existence of the Son with the Father. For, the belief of the nature of the son of a man being the same as that of the father, though it justifies the idea of the Son of God being God, is utterly repugnant to the possibility of the Son being coeval with his Father. It is evident that if a son of a man be supposed coeval with his father, he must be considered something *more* extraordinary than a monster.

"It is believed by all religious sects, that when God reveals his will or law to the human race, he reveals them through their language in its common acceptation. I beg therefore of the Editor to favour me with a direct reply to the following question. Do the missionary gentlemen take the word 'God' as a proper name, or as a common one? all nouns being divided into two kinds, common and proper. In the former case, that is, if they consider the term God appropriated to one individual existence, as every other proper name is, they must relinquish the idea of the Son of God being the very God. How can we think the son of John or James to be John or James, or coeval with John or James? And in the latter case, that is, if they receive the term God as a common name, they may maintain the opinion that the Son of God is God, in the same way as the son of a man is man, which, as the Editor says, 'must necessarily be the case;' but they, in this case, cannot be justified in possessing a belief in the equal duration of the Son with the Father; for, *every son whatever may be his nature must have existence originating subsequently to that of his father.* The only difference between these two common nouns, *God* and *man*, would be, that the latter includes a great many individuals under it, and the former only three distinct persons, though of superior power and nature. We see individuals, under one term of *mankind*, though they are distinct in person, yet one in nature, as being all men. In like manner, three beings under one Godhead, according to the Editor, though they are distinct in person, are yet, I infer, considered by him one in nature as Gods; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. Is this the *unity* of God which the Editor professes? Can *this doctrine* justify him in ridiculing Hindoo polytheism: because many of them say that under one Godhead there are more than three beings, distinct in person, but one in nature?"

The second objection is taken up after all the rest are discussed. We must say, that neither the answer of the missionaries to it, nor the reply of the Bramun to their answer, seem to be much to the purpose. The third point is managed much better: and the advantage, in our opinion, is entirely on the side of the Bramun. "They say God is one, and yet say that the Father is God the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God."—The editor of the Friend of India admits the fairness of this statement, and supports the doctrine as other Trinitarians do.

"But," says the Bramun, "instead of shewing the reasonableness of the idea of three distinct Gods being one God, as applied for, he confesses the total inconsistency of this doctrine with reason, and makes the Bible responsible for it, saying, 'But the Bible, while it fully reveals these facts, still forbears to inform us how the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, exist, and form the triune God:' and adds, 'nor had it informed, are we certain that we should have comprehended it.' The Editor, or his colleagues, ought to have taken into consideration such unreasonableness attaching to the most important of all their doctrines, before they had published in the Sumachar Durpun, the letter accusing the Vedant, and the rest of the Hindoo Shastrus, of the want of reason; a circumstance which might have saved the Editor the reluctant avowal of the unreasonableness of the foundation of his own system of faith."

We cannot but stop here to notice one expression of this same editor. Who he is, we know not, but we are bound to suppose him a very strong pillar of the cause which he tries to support. "Nor had it informed," says he, "are we certain that we should have comprehended it." Extraordinary *information* this must must be, to be sure. Trinitarians often tell us that their doctrine was not meant to be understood, but simply to be believed, and we have been apt to call in question the validity of even this assertion, as we much doubt whether an unintelligible proposition can be made the subject either of belief or disbelief. But here is a man, who is so exceedingly diffident of the capacity of the human intellect, and so completely ignorant of his mother tongue, that he is by no means certain, if the Deity himself had *informed* us of the nature and manner of a triune existence, whether we should have understood it. That is to say, he doubts whether we should be informed, after we had been informed. This is truly mysterious, and as much above our humble comprehension as the doctrine of the Trinity itself. Here is an unintelligible doctrine,

and an unintelligible explanation of the unintelligible doctrine, which all together is called *information*. The editor of the Friend of India must surely be placed at the head of the orthodox divines of the present day.

In answering the objection against the Trinity, drawn from its unreasonableness, the old expedient had been employed, of comparing it to the growth of grass and trees, and the action of mind upon matter, the manner of which growth and action we do not comprehend. This inapplicable comparison is treated by the Bramun, as follows:

"How is it possible for the Editor, or for any one possessed of common sense, not to perceive the gross error of drawing an analogy from things around and within us, to the three distinct persons of the Godhead in one existence; which, so far from being around or within us, exist only in the imagination of Christians. Here the growth of a tree, and its producing leaves and flowers, as well as the operation of mind on matter, being around and within us, are commonly perceptible by all men, whether Christians or not Christians; a denial of which is utterly impossible for one who is possessed of the senses. It is very true that the exact manner in which plants grow, or the mind operates, and the precise principles of nature which act upon them are not thoroughly understood. But all that these facts amount to is, that things around or within us, whether visible, or demonstrated by visible facts, compel conviction. Do the three persons of the Godhead in unity exist like growing trees, or bodies joined to mind? Are they phenomena commonly perceptible alike by Christians and not Christians? Or are they like mountains of ice in northern countries, which, though they are not seen or felt by us, yet are reported to us by eye witnesses, without any contradiction from others who have also passed the places where they are said to exist, and where they are liable to be seen by any one: that we should be compelled to believe the existence of the triune God, like that of growing trees, operating minds, or mountains of ice, though we cannot understand them? Christians may perhaps consider the Trinity as perceptible by them, through the force of early instructions, in the same manner as the followers of Tuntru doctrines, among Hindoos in Bengal, consider God as consisting of five distinct persons, and yet as one God; and as the generality of modern Hindoos esteem numerous incarnations under one Godhead, almost as an experienced fact, from their early habits. How can Christians, who in general justly pride themselves on their cultivated understanding, admit such an analogy, or justify any one in misleading others with such sophistries?"

A few lines further on, the native charges the missionary with inconsistency in saying that "the triune God had not condescended to inform us of the precise mode in which his infinite and glorious nature exists and acts," and afterwards particularizing certain modes of his existence and actions, such as the creation of the world by the Son, his incarnation, ascension, mediatorial office, and the descent of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove. He then proceeds with what we regard as perhaps his best argument.

"Is it possible even to conceive for a moment the identity between three beings, one of them in heaven, expressing his pleasure at the conduct of the second, who at the same time on the earth was performing religious rites, and the third of them residing between heaven and earth, descending on the second at the will of the first? If the difference of bodies and situations, as well as of actions and employments be not sufficient to set aside the idea of the identity and real unity of persons, there would be no means of distinguishing one person from another, and no criterion would be left for considering a tree different from a rock, or a bird from a man. Is this the doctrine which the Editor ascribes to God? and can any book, which contains an idea that defies the use of the senses, be considered worthy to be ascribed to that Being, who has endued the human race with senses and understanding for their use and guidance?"

"God the Son is declared by the Editor to have *laid aside his glory* for a season, and to have prayed his Father to give him the same glory, and also to have taken the form of a servant. *Is it consistent with the nature of the immutable God to lay aside any part of his condition, and pray for it again?* Is it conformable to the nature of the Supreme Ruler of the universe to take the form of a servant, though only for a season? Is this the true idea of God, which the Editor maintains? I shall be obliged if the Editor can show that the polytheistical doctrines, maintained by Hindoos, are in any degree more unreasonable than his own. If not, he will not, I trust, endeavour in future to introduce among them one set of polytheistical sentiments as a substitute for another set; *both of them being equally and solely protected by the shield of mystery.*"

(Concluded in our next.)

THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 9, 1823.

Successful result of candid investigation.

We are assured that our worthy correspondent, Erasmus, has stated the *real* difficulties of his mind on the subject of that *salvation* which is compatible with both *justice* and *forgiveness*, (see Nos. 12 and 16) and we think our readers will agree with us in admitting that he has pursued his subject with precision and ability—and we rejoice to see him close the discussion with that candor which does honor to the character of the christian.

Mr. Editor.—I hereby tender you my warmest thanks for the time and labor which you have so generously bestowed upon the subject of *salvation*, and acknowledge, with pleasure, that your answers have afforded a satisfaction that I have never obtained from any other source. I am now satisfied. The way to me appears clear—the flowers of consistency deck my path—the smiles of peace and *virtue* attract my attention. Virtue extends her arms to embrace me; while sin, with its hideous form induces me to forsake her unpleasant habitation.

Believe me Sir, yours in the bonds of peace and love. ERASMUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD.

DEAR SIR.

The following questions are respectfully submitted. Your solution will gratify, at least, an occasional reader of your numbers.

Question 1. If Christ and his Apostles taught the doctrine of Universal Salvation, at what period in the christian Church, did that doctrine become unpopular, or obsolete?

Question 2. If the primitive christians taught Universal Salvation, why did they suffer persecution? P.

REMARKS.

Whether Christ and his Apostles did, or did not teach Universal Salvation, admits of not the least doubt; for we can refer to their plain, unequivocal testimony on this important point. Of the many passages which clearly speak of this particular, notice the following—"All things are delivered unto me of my Father." St. Math. XI. 27. "All that the Father giveth me *shall* come unto me: and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. For I came down from Heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, *that of all which he hath given me I should lose* NOTHING, but should raise it up again at the last day." St. John 6, 37—39. "Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to *condemnation*; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon *all men unto justification of life*." Rom. 5. 18. The question "at what period did that doctrine become unpopular?" is answered by reference to the history of the Church. It began to be unpopular previous to the *nuptial ceremony* between *Church* and *State*, in the reign of CONSTANTINE the Great; it continued quite unpopular from the period at which the council of Nice was held, till after the discovery of the art of Printing—till after the Reformation by Luther, Calvin, and their cotemporaries; since which auspicious periods, as the light of science shines with a more pure, a more diffusive ray, and as knowledge increases, this heavenly doctrine becomes more and more *popular*, ("our enemies themselves being judges.") till it has already become far *less unpopular*, than when it was first preached by the Saviour of mankind—who, for preaching an unpopular doctrine, was reviled, persecuted and finally put to death by the *popular Partialists*, the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* of his day!

From the third, to the fourteenth century—that *gloomy night of more than a thousand years of moral darkness*, the doctrine of UNIVERSAL BENEVOLENCE was generally neither known nor practiced: the awful gloom of *eternal death* darkened the horizon of the human mind—barbarous *partiality* froze the tender charities of life—*ignorance* rioted in destruction—the spirit of *damnation* and *merciless vengeance* wielded her bloody spears by thousands—while the Angel of delusion eclipsed "the sun of righteousness," armed Heaven with *immortal vengeance* against earth—and as the destination of an *infinitely angry God*, pointed wretched man to climes where,

"Billows of angry fire shall roll,
To blast the rebel worm,
And beat upon his naked soul,
In one *eternal* storm"!!!

When "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and *all* dominions shall *serve* and *obey* him." Dan. 7. 27. then, there will be a religion which will be *popular* without being *pernicious* and oppressive—then will supreme love to God and universal love to mankind, bring about that glorious period when,

"All crimes shall cease and ancient fraud shall fail,
Returning justice lift aloft her scale,
Peace o'er the world her olive wand extend,
And white rob'd innocence from Heaven descend."

2d. "If the primitive christians taught universal salvation, Why did they suffer persecution?" Answer, They *suffered* persecution because they were *persecuted*, and they were persecuted because they preached an *unpopular* doctrine—because they would not relinquish their integrity—because their enemies under pretence of great sanctity and piety, possessed the most bigoted, cruel, partial, and unmerciful temper—and finally because the teachers of the *popular* religion of those times, not being able to meet the primitive christians in fair *argument*, "*gnashed on them with their teeth*," and substituted force and *violence* for argument!

In all ages of the world, like causes produce like effects "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?" St. Mathew 10. 25.

The advocates of a religion which opposes the pride, prejudice and wickedness of a vain world, must expect persecution, till their enemies are converted to "the faith once delivered to the saints," and thereby delivered from that enmity which is the invariable characteristic of the spirit of *Antichrist*.

FOR THE HERALD OF SALVATION

Have you a hope?

Every believer in the doctrines of men—every adherent to the "traditions of the elders"—every advocate of the doctrine of endless woe, and every opposer of the heart-cheering sentiment of the reconciliation of all men, is in the habit of inquiring of all with whom he has intercourse, "if they have a hope?" To this question the person addressed answers in the affirmative. That the interrogator and he who answers, do not understand the nature of the question, will appear by an examination of their hypothesis. They are abettors and avowed believers of the opinion that a LARGE majority of GOD'S offspring will be consigned to the flames of a never-ending hell. In short the fundamental principle of their hypothesis is endless misery. Of this particular feature they are very tenacious. No one can enjoy the privileges of their church unless he assents to this horrid idea, every one who has courage and discernment enough to reject it, is publicly denounced as a *heretic*, *innovater*, *subverter* of *religion*, &c.

But what do they hope for? They hope *they* shall be *saved* Has the believer in endless misery any reason to hope *he* will be saved, while others are to be excluded? no. His faith is never-ending torment to a great part of the human family. This is the main *pillar* of his religious fabric; all others are of minor importance. Hence you cannot reconcile their *faith* with their *hope*, unless a man may believe one thing and hope for another, to admit this, would be admitting the greatest absurdity: hope, is nothing less nor more than expectation or desire, hence we may say we expect salvation, this expectation arises solely from our faith, and is the production of assenting to certain evidences which form the *basis* of our belief. If therefore, we hope for salvation, and intend to preserve an agreement between our faith and hope, we must believe in the doctrine of *salvation* and not *damnation*.

By a practical improvement of this opinion, we shall be better enabled to see the propriety and force of this reasoning. A child hopes his father will give him some valuable property: why does he thus hope? The answer is, because he has positive, or supposed evidence of the ability and disposition of his father. He has faith in his father's goodness; he has evidence of his ability and he reasonably expects a legacy. But suppose the father has no *property*; suppose too, he is not disposed to assist his son, would he (the son) not be very unwise and foolish to *hope* for a rich bequest from his father? certainly he would. the conduct of the son cannot (if he hoped for a legacy) be reconciled with his faith. Now the believer of the doctrine of irrecoverable woe, *hopes* for *salvation* when he *believes* God has nothing for the wicked but *damnation*: his hope is *salvation* and his *faith* *damnation*. If his faith is *based* upon good evidence, he is unreasonable in *hoping* to be *saved*; he believes that GOD has an exhaustless store of *damnation* for the wicked, if this be true, how can he *escape?* He will say perhaps, that he is not wicked, that he has repented of, and forsaken his *sins*, and consequently, has secured to himself eternal or *endless salvation*. But how can this be? he was once wicked and an unbeliever, did this salvation exist for him before he believed? no; because he is no more secure now than before, if we admit that it did, it must then be supposed that his repentance and faith *created* his *salvation*, and that it did not exist *anterior* to his repenting and believing; this cannot be true, for faith does not create its object. The opinion, therefore, that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of the sinner before he believes, (though the sinner be ignorant of it) is reasonable and scriptural; and that which supposes he is not, is unscriptural as well as unreasonable. All men are called upon to believe that *God* is their Saviour. If they believe this, they may reasonably hope to be saved. It was for the *hope* of the *resurrection* (not damnation) that PAUL was called in question. He that has not this *hope* found-

ed upon a scriptural and rational faith, may truly be said to be in a *hopeless* condition.

G. B L.

Mr. Editor,

There are many considerations which lead me seriously to doubt the endless duration of punishment.—A few of which I will state.

1st The vast disproportion there is between the sins committed in this short life, and infinite suffering It is easily observable that a wise and good being will punish those he has under his care no more than is absolutely necessary and for the best general good. And it is evident from all the examples given in the divine testimony that our kind heavenly Father never inflicts more punishment upon his erring children, who are blindly pursuing the paths of iniquity in search of happiness, than enough to reclaim them: more than this would be cruelty. Heb. 12. 10 "For they (Fathers of our flesh) verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure, but he (God) for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness." Therefore no punishment can be inflicted by our heavenly Father that does not serve to correct and reclaim the punished. That sin does not deserve an infinite punishment may be seen by a consideration of Isa. 40, 2 "Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she *hath* received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins."

The benevolent King of heaven wounds but to heal, kills but to make alive and suffers us to be in darkness, error and doubt, but to unfold to our enraptured vision light, truth and salvation. The Light that is diffused from the resplendent sun of Righteousness, making manifest the truth of God, enables us to see with the eye of faith the blessedness of that happy state, beyond this transitory residence, where all the wanting sons and daughters of Adam shall be blessed with perfect felicity and immortal joy.

2d. Endless misery is opposed to the will of God, "who will have all men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth," and "who doeth according to his will" not only "in the armies of heaven," but also "among the inhabitants of the earth," and not all the combined forces of all which can be exerted throughout the universe can oppose or stay his Omnipotent arm I ask any opposer of the universal restoration, whether God will save all mankind cannot, or whether he can and will not, whether he have neither power nor will, whether he have both power and will—If he have the power and not the will it is malignity, which is contrary to the nature of God: if he have the will and not the power it is weakness, which is no less contrary to his nature: if he have neither will nor power it is both weakness and malignity; if he have both will and power which alone is consonant to all the glorious perfections of God, modified by unbounded love, how can there be one that will not be saved?

3d. Endless misery seems to be contrary to the precepts of the beloved Redeemer, love and impartiality we see to be the characteristical features of all the precepts of our Saviour. He exhorts us to be perfect as our heavenly Father is perfect "who maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." Love is the law of heaven from which one jot or title shall in no wise pass till all be fulfilled "God is love," therefore any law having for its author the Legislator of heaven, must be a modification of love; this divine law will never be fulfilled till every intelligent being becomes God's loving and obedient subject: For so long as there are any who do not love God supremely and their neighbors as themselves the law of Heaven will be broken and not be all fulfilled—it is that law of which our Saviour said one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass till all be fulfilled The Saviour's command is to love all mankind, and this commandment is to all and upon all, therefore the doctrine that teaches an eternal opposition to the mandate of our Saviour must be wrong.

4th. The glorious consequences of the gospel, contrasted with some ideas which are opposed to it. The sublime Prophet Isa. with his prophetic ken piercing through the long succession of future, distant years, clearly saw the glorious consequences of the gospel and exclaimed (God speaking by him) "I have sworn by myself the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return. That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear, surely shall say in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." "The ransomed of the Lord shall come to Sion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads they shall obtain joy and gladness, sorrow and sighing shall flee away." With this agrees the language of the apostle. the man Christ Jesus "gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time." The perfection of divine love, is to love our enemies as ourselves; therefore, if I love others as myself and see them in misery, I undergo as much misery as I am sensible they do. Then upon the sup-

position of there being an endless hell, our love will endlessly torment us. Now unless in the heavenly world we are made insensible to all the sympathetic feelings of our natures, and totally indifferent to the sufferings of our fellow creatures, (and I see no *reason* that can be alledged in support of such an idea, and certainly there is no *scripture*,) it follows that no person can be perfectly happy till *all are*. In the cabinet of heaven the glorious scheme of universal happiness was devised by the infinite wisdom of Jehovah, known among angels and arch-angels, revealed to all *God's* holy prophets, rejoiced in by the patriarchs and apostles, and finally all holy beings throughout the vast domain of the Almighty, have *believed* it, except a few weak good men on earth. This is the only system which is worthy of the *God* of purity and love. This heavenly doctrine well understood, will make us impervious to all the fatal dogmas of man; it will clothe us in such habiliments that we shall remain uninjured by those hot flashes which dart forth from the dark and horrible cloud of mystery, and menace destruction on all who dare oppose, and attended by terrible peals of ecclesiastic thunder, followed by the soul chilling blasts of endless misery — Timorous mortals, dreading a storm of divine wrath, have fled to the church to be included in its pale, in hopes of being sheltered by their humane priests from a storm of endless destruction—from an infuriated, wrathful and almighty Tyrant!

But we are permitted to hail the happy time, in which divine light begins to shine—our hearts rejoice in the riches of infinite love, and we clearly see "that the Lord is good to all and his tender mercies are over all his works." Heavenly light begins to shine upon the mental horizon with unremitted splendour, and we hope soon to see all those mystic clouds dispeled, which have long darkened the christian world with the profoundest gloom. The church is now coming up out of the wilderness leaning on the arm of her beloved. Mortals begin to behold that love which is stronger than death —reaching from heaven to earth, "connecting all below" to "all above."

CANDOUR.

Another Conversion in the Ministry.

The Boston *Universalist Magazine*' of the 12th inst. announces the conversion of ELIPHALET CASE, jr. of Plymouth, (Mass) to the faith of Universal Salvation. For about seven years he has been a member, and four years a preacher in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

POETRY.

SELECTED

THE REAPER'S SONG.

Ye verdant hills, ye smiling fields,
Thou earth, whose breast spontaneous yields
To man a rich supply;
Echo, whose mimic notes prolong
The melting strains, and bear along,
O'er distant glad sounding caves among,
The mountain shepherd's artless song,
Soft melting to the sky.

Attend the reapers' joyful lays,
And bear the tribute of their praise
To nature's bounteous King;
Whose voice, loud sounding from the pole,
In thunder oft is heard to roll,
And oft has melted down the soul,
When murmuring along it stole
The zephyrs' silken wing!

With bread, the heart of man to cheer,
Set, bending low, the ripen'd ear
Bows its luxuriant head!
In vain, ye swains, had been your care,
Had not He caused the blight to spare
The promise of the summer fair,
And bade the sun, the rain, the air,
Their gracious influence shed.

He bade the soft refreshing gale
Blow gently down the teeming vale,
Nor hurt the peeping grain;
But when the ear began to rise,
To him we raised our anxious eyes;
Oft from the cisterns of the skies
He sent, in mercy, rich supplies,
Early and latter rain.

And now his hand hath crowned our toil
We joy like those that share the spoil,
The harvest home to bear!
With shouts the laughing pastures ring,
With grateful hearts, ye reapers, sing
The praise of heav'n's eternal King
Through whose paternal care ye bring
The produce of the year.

Why should not ministers, of different sentiments exchange, and preach to each other's congregations? Will each one say my doctrine is the truth, the doctrines which other's preach are erroneous? Be it so, then why not go and preach the truth to those congregations which are in the habit of hearing error? Will each one say, I am willing to preach truth to other congregations, but I am not willing to have error preached to mine: therefore I cannot exchange? But, dear brethren, if you have enlightened your congregations with the clear lamp of truth you need not fear that darkness will put out your light.
Universalist Magazine.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY IN WATERTOWN, N. Y. AT $1 PER ANN. PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

*****

S. A. ABBEY, PRINTER.